



PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 5725.0355-01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
Laurent VIDAL et al. ) Group Art Unit: 1626  
Application No.: 10/091,492 ) Examiner: Sonya Wright  
Filed: March 7, 2002 )  
For: COMPOSITIONS FOR DYEING )  
KERATINOUS FIBERS COMPRISING )  
PYRAZOLOAZOLES; THEIR USE IN )  
DYEING AS OXIDATION BASE AND )  
DYEING PROCESS; AND NOVEL )  
PYRAZOLOAZOLES )

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RECEIVED  
AUG 23 2003  
TECH CENTER 1600/2800

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

In the Office Action dated May 30, 2003, the Examiner required an election of species under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Specifically, the Examiner requires Applicants to "provide a structure or chemical name of the elected species, and ... identify where the species is disclosed in the specification." Office Action at 2. The Examiner also requests that Applicants "identify which of the formulae (I'a) through (I'f) in claim 68 the elected species corresponds to." Id.

The election of species requirement is respectfully traversed. To be fully responsive, however, Applicants elect with traverse the species shown in Preparation Example A on page 39 of the specification, namely, 1H-7-amino-2,6-dimethylpyrazolo[1,5-b]-1,2,4-triazole hydrochloride. This species

corresponds to formula (I'a) in claim 68 and is also listed on page 31, line 6 of the specification.

Applicants traverse the election of species requirement on the grounds that the Examiner has not shown that there would be a serious burden to examine all of the recited species of the claimed compound of formula (I'). In fact, the Examiner has failed to state that any burden exists to examine all of the species of formula (I') recited in the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all the recited species of formula (I') continue to be examined in this application.

If the Examiner chooses, however, to maintain the election of species requirement, Applicants expect the Examiner, if the elected species is found allowable, to continue to examine the full scope of claims 68-75 to the extent necessary to determine the patentability of these pending claims, i.e., extending the search to a reasonable number of the non-elected species, as is the duty according to M.P.E.P. § 803.02 and 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 20, 2003

By: Thalia V. Warnement  
Thalia V. Warnement  
Reg. No. 39,064